REMARKS

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

- Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11-13, 17-19, 21-27, 32, and 33 are pending.
- Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11-13, 17-19 and 21-33 are rejected.
- Claims 1, 12, 17, and 19 are amended.
- Claims 28-31 are canceled.
- Claims 2, 6, 8-10, 14-16 and 20 were previously canceled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11-13, 17-18, 21-22, and 25-33 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Brisken et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,735,811.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, and 22

Claims 1 and 17 recite the feature, "the anchoring points comprise an adhesive that seals the gap at a distal end and proximal end of the gap." Brisken et al. do not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of Claims 1 and 17. Thus, Claims 1 and 17 are patentably allowable over Brisken et al. Claims 3-5, 7, and 11 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reason that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 18, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 17 and are allowable for at least the same reason that Claim 17 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections of Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, and 22.

Claims 12, 13, 25-27, 32, and 33

Brisken et al. do not disclose all of the limitations of Claims 12, 13 and 25-27. In

particular, with respect to Claim 12, Brisken et al. do not disclose a medical assembly, "wherein the distal end of a transducer is positioned at a distance from the proximal end of an adjacent transducer to allow the catheter to be flexible and bend in the area between the pair of adjacent transducers." Similarly, with respect to Claim 25, Brisken et al. do not disclose a medical device "wherein the first end of the second transducer is positioned at a distance from the second end of the first transducer so as to allow the lumen to be flexible in the area between the second end of the first transducer and the first end of the second transducer."

Brisken et al. state "although not specifically shown in FIGS. 7-10, it is to be understood that the distal end of the catheter supporting the transducer elements and the interface member will usually be fabricated from a rigid material, typically stainless steel with a Rockwell hardness of 35." col. 12, lines 29-33. A rigid material is not flexible and will not bend in the area between the transducers. Thus, Brisken et al. do not teach or suggest the above-mentioned features. Claims 13, 32, and 33 depend from Claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reason that Claim 12 is allowable. Claim 26 and 27 depend from Claim 25 and are allowable for at least the same reason that Claim 25 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of Claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 27, 32, and 33.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 19, 23, and 24 under 35 USC §102(a) as being unpatentable over Brisken et al. in view of Bock (USPN 5,618,275).

Claim 19 recites the feature, "the gap is sealed by an adhesive at a distal end and proximal end of the gap." Brisken et al. do not teach the above-mentioned feature of Claim 19. Bock does not cure the deficiency of Brisken et al. with respect to Claim 19. Thus, Claim 19 is patentably allowable over Brisken et al. in view of Bock. Claims 23 and 24 depend on Claim 19 and allowable for at least the same reason that Claim 19 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of Claims 19, 23, and 24.

CONCLUSION

Since all claims are in a condition for allowance, please issue a Notice of Allowability so stating. If I can be of any help, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2006

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
One Maritime Plaza
Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone 415.954.0297
Facsimile 415.393.9887
mlupkowski@ssd.com

Mark Lupkowski, Ph. D.
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 49,010